Memo

(41)

×9/13.1.88.

Appeal petition from Gangamma

Mavinhalli village and Mavinhalli Amani Kere were constituted into separate Patéli charges at the survey settlement of the Gubbi (formerly Kadaba) Taluk in 1882.

Gangigowda who possesses a half share in the hak has all along been the Patél of the village. The Dy. Commr of Tumkur has now registered the Amani Kere also in the name of Gangigowda's grandson, Honne Gowda (13 yrs of age) and appointed Kempalinga Hak, a

nominee of Gauge Sondes
Track as Executive
pending the attainment
of his majority by the boy
Howard Sondes.
It is against this order
that the present appeal
is brought by Gauge who
who represents the
Sister half of the Track
and has the support
of the remaining share-
holders of the same.
The D.J. Court-in his
orders says that it is
necessary to consult
the wishes of Gauge Sondes
in filling up the Vacancy
office of Executive
because he has been
ess (duties) relating
ding the duties of the
office.
From the references
produced by the appellant

3

as well as Gunga Gorda
& which the D.C.'s
order does not refer
the duties of the Amani
Kéré would appear
& have been performed
promiscuously by mem-
bers representing both
branches of the tribe at different
intervals up to 1882.
A Maji Sharubo[illegible]
[illegible]ther of the village
of Amani Kéré does
not appear) has deposed
that Gunga Gorda only
entered upon the duties
of the Amani Kéré since
the settlement (1882)
and on the opposite
branch protesting against
his doing so he is said
to have quieted them
by promising to get
either the village or the
Amani Kéré registered
in the names of the
members of the

Appeal branch at
the settlement of the
Nakka Potes.
Ganesh Gowda does
not appear
to possess more than a half
share interest in the
hak... He admits that
the appellant is entitled
to a 1/16th share of the
hak. But the appoint-
ment of the appellant
& the remainder are
also supported by the
testimony among others, of
Siva Ganesh Gowda whose
name is mentioned in
the Barabakuti Kef:
of 1864 as representing
a half share interest
in the hak of the village.
No separate mention of
Nakdars was made in
the said Kef: for the

xg 25-2-Kor /88.

5

The Auditor's report favors the appt also I said that in case/ circumstances, there-as Gangadhara is admitted & insolvent Submitted for orders. 17/3/88.

Seems the court want whether the minor has attained age & been put in charge of the office & whether he has been doing the work. The amount of Rs 8 per allowance which the village Amani Keri is to be stated. Information should also be sent as to whether the appellant still wishes his claim to be prosecuted.

17.6.96

Left Dr. Kol 17/6

Translation of the Gwalior Service
Ameldars Regn 3.25.11.86 to the
Deputy-Commr, Simla District

Thana having been appointed
Patel & Patwari of the village
Kathi Bagani, a notice was issued
and circulated. One Ganga Ram,
Patel Raider of the village came
forward and presented a petition
stating that since the thana
had been discharging all the
Patel duties from time immem-
-morial, his grandson Kanwar
Gurdas, a boy of 15 years, may be
registered as Patel and that
one Kanshaiya Thana of Thana-
-gani village be appointed as
his Patwari till he attains
age. In addition to this he
has made a deposition and
produced certain documents
to show that the office was in
his employment.

From a glance at
the documents presented it is
evident

incidents that since 1835 the Range
Guards and Home Guards were
carrying out the duties of cultivation,
and other
repair. collection of miscellaneous
income which fact is borne
out by the tabies used from
by the Court Auditors. It is
also stated that the above said
persons were the elder brothers
of Grange Guards. It is also clear
from the numerous chits written
to them by the Chairman of this Court
since 1883, and the collection book,
that Grange Guards have been lately
also the duties of collection of
this Court.

The Registers of 1841 shows
Executions & Mortgages for Examination
for the above said Grange Guards
and Scottish Mississippi Guards.
Therefore it had not been settled
that Grange Guards should alone
look after the work. At present
the Court is separated from the

[illegible] the Registers
this register
the records. In
obtained on the
Secretary of this Court
of the Grange
in the column of
of Sirajganj Grange
Officers have
Chairman of Court

village and reserve Belgi

fied to the Jangamma, conf

Linga Gauda having petitioned

Gauda in his name

for the registration of the share

of the said Virasikte Gauda

and for taking the mark thereof

from their cattle No. 3 / 198 also the

granted to him. Honnegauda,

Lakkanna Gauda & Jangamma

who also petitioned the Gauda

that one of them (viz. Gauda)

Linga Gauda) viz Jangamma

may be registered and mark

taken from him, were given

an endorsement No. 80 / 403 -

Jangamma deposed that the

said duties of Gauda like

at first

were being performed by his

elder brother Hanjinde Gauda

and thereafter by his maternal

uncle Linnappa Gauda.

that

that since the survey settlement
Kapiti Grange Garda has made 2
additions
to the Lots 1½ and other Lessees
making Estates to fairly
them by Buying part of the
Paekita Block he would get
their share registered in
their name, that for the reason
he left quiet and that now
by the consent of all the other
Lessees the Block should be
registered in his name. the
Otto produced certain Documents
and cited instances in proof thereof.
Rangiwahia deposed that
Shanley since 1874 half Lessee
Grange Garda lived at the
Lower Lakes. but of the Lessees
of the other half two viz
Rangiwahia Garda & Rangiwahia
Garda lived at the Lakes
& Wanuiakura Rangiwahia
Garda & Hone Garda and
Rangiwahia Garda & Kahukura

to the Gangamai
Sirdesai Ramaji Pandharkar
also defined to the above effect
and further urged that since the
settlement by Yesaji Pandharkar
having after the death of the
Patil Sakharam, that the Patil Sakharam
Yesaji Pandharkar should
by carrying the Kafiyat the Sirdesai
Patji Settlement he would get
one of the villages registered in
their name that now they all
consent with the rights being
made in Gangamai name.

Chit No 2 produced by
Gangamai purporting that
have been granted by the Samast
Sirdesai to Gangamai Aba
Pandharkar Pandurang Pandharkar
about, that the Patil should
held responsible for keeping
the Lands behind the Ghats
under cultivation. This
is dated 1871, Chit No 3

Nos purporting to have been granted by the Sirkar to Siva Ganga Zamin mentions something regarding the registration of title.

No. 7 a chit granted by the Amildar & the Nirgunti of the Talaiyari bank of Manamadhi in the year Vijaya, dated 21-5-25 stating the duty of bringing under cultivation the lands belonging that tank had been entrusted to one Manamadhi Saravanan. No. 10 which purports to be a Sarkaran dated 23.9.64 shows that it was executed by Rangi Gauda for the 4 persons namely Valt the share, that therein the Nisedars agreed to leave the Patels in his hands making it a point that all of them should share whatever was derived in revenue matters.

Nos. 15, 19, 21, 24, 25, 28, 30 & 36 purporting to [illegible]

Shewith by Sirkar Counsel to
Learn after Ganda mentions
something regarding the
Collection of revenue of the
Land behind the Cart.

Ganga Ganda has stated
that complainant Gangama is a
distant cousin of his, that he is the
Receiver of only 1/16 th portion of
the land, that the Patta of Income
(Gangama)
here also Could be made in his
name, that since the Ganga Ganda
Who has been looking after the duty
from the beginning, is a man of
Children the afforesaid Income should
be made in the name of the 4th
Mari Ganda
son, who is employed & also
after the work. that if the Receiver
had any right they may file
a suit against him (Ganga Ganda)
and that the collection books of

Amainkere

Information produced by Gangama might have been obtained by him from the Kambang when invited to this and subsequent meeting. Gangama Gada further produced a Cross Information to have been executed by all the Sirdars at the time when the registry was made in his name in 1871 wherein they all agreed to his doing the work.

Gangama blames Gange Gada by saying that he is a very large minded, that civil cases have been issued against Gada, however that consequently he is a fraud and that he has misappropriated certain jewels belonging to the Caste of the village. Gange Gada says that since he is a widow of many children he is entitled to

14

to clearly instruct the civil court for which decree there is already ~~a~~ a need, that in addition to the six silver vessels, properly left and that he has not misappropriated any jewel belonging to the temple. I made some record regarding the temple jewels. Some of these are with the Pujari and the others with the Patel. The Pujari says that the Patel whose custody is missing as alleged by the Patel. The Pujari says that it was lost in the temple itself. Ganjam says that the Patel himself has misappropriated it.

The Board in the Register of the year Kaliyuga (1804) mentions only the names of the Chandikas and Nirgunti of Annavaram but not of the Patel.

From all these circumstances
it can be gathered that no Patel
was appointed by Govt for Gadarwara,
after the office was managed by the
members of both sets of parties,
that after these communications
were addressed to the Officers
who conducted the duties
from that period it is
evident that persons from the
complainants party also
conducted the duties.

At present competent
Patels are indispensable necessary
for all Amani Tanks. Have
been in search of competent
persons who for the Patels of such
of the tanks for which there are none.

In selecting a proper
man for the Patel of Gaurmahari

to ~~afford~~ choose in preference to a stranger, a consent thereto from the family which has given occasional assistance to the Bank.

If we take that into consideration since one of the two equal divisions into which a treaty of the village, there seem to be no objection to effecting exchanges with the consent of all members of the family to which the Bank. Further it having been contended that Gangamma is better off than Gangadhar he may, if afforded, be appointed for the present. Orders are solicited in the matter.

The deputy commissioner's order appealed against is as follows:—

Here

It is necessary to allot a separate
Patel to Amaniekere. It is also
necessary to listen to the prayer
of Gange Gauda who was dying
the only from the beginning in
accordance with this statement
register this pradhan Gowda Gauda
and take work from Mailampa
Naika, the son-in-law of Gange
Gauda till the boy attains
age."

On a reference made by the Asst
that the name Mailampa Naika
was not correct and that should
be Kempa Lingappa Naika stated
ordered in his No 7,793/24-1-8,
to change the name accordingly.

Sd/-

Translation of the
Gubbi Taluk Amin
No: S 25-11-86. 4
Dy Comm: Tum

18

I Marigauda.

Hanegauda Hanegauda Gangegauda
(Patel) (Patel) Patel
Marinhalli in 1864.

Lingegauda Hanagangamma. Hanegauda Marigauda
(Present Patel of Marinhalli)

Hanegauda
(Patel of Manchere)
Comes Petitioner.

Gangamma (Petitioner)
= a hostile of the Patel of Marinhalli

There is no doubt that appellant is also entitled to the said suit — that same was settled in 1882 the suit has been wholly enjoyed in the share of two separate shares (Marinhalli & Amanikere) — The Patel Ramagauda & Patel of Amanikere and his father Lingegauda (who appears to be the first day was heard) enjoyed the Patel of Marinhalli since 15 years — The Camp Khatas are noted — that when a vacancy occurs the claim of appellant & the Co-sharer who has succeeded the vacancy adopted as in keeping of the Village Patel and a small sum is a small sum.

21-1-1

16-1-88 54 53

St. 2 No 3033

19



(2)

To

L. R. 31-87-1

The Diwan to His Highness
the Maha Rajadharaja
Mysore.

The petition of Gurjamma
Widow of Late Subramanialle
of the Chittanadalli Magani
of the Gubbi Taluk.

Most respectfully sheweth.

That your humble petitioner
and his ancestors were the hereditary
Patels of Chittanadalli the Inam land
attached thereto is evident from the
Government records and the several
deeds herein enclosed.

That prior to the year 1864 the
Patelship office of the village and the
Inam land stood in the name
of Honnesa

Land Surveyor Gauge found produced petitioner before the Magistrate and several other Papers that he would for the petitioner's name registered in the Patta of the Annai Lakshmi during the Field Survey settlement.

The question of appointing a Separate Patta for the said Annai Lakshmi having recently engaged in the Accounts of the petitioner and the applicant Gauge Surveyor and being fully satisfied as to the genuineness of the petitioner's claim (as to the existence of the registered holder Siva Gauge Surveyor to the office) recommended him (Petitioner) for the appointment of Patta of the Annai Lakshmi, on the ground that Gauge Surveyor another branch of the original Registered Accounts, has already the Patta of the village

The Commissioner without enquiring into the petitioner's claim and returning the record

Counsel

(Ref his report No: 1239/1 dt 20th Nov 88)

connected with the care, ignorance & lic
hereditary, obtained the office and
Commissioned that the necessary Volume 20, 765
the minutes of Special Grand Arbi 8/15 Appeal 87
above, & the Said Lodge should
be reinstated in the Fraternity, the
Committee find a strong, & unfounded
in General the decision of the Grand Lodge
the Law.

Shall the petitioners respect
fully request a dismissal of the com-
plaint, & the revocation of Grand the
Warrant, & that the recommendation
made by the Committee.

The Committee recommend
as, & that the proceedings of the Grand
Steward's Lodge of the 21st January
Friendly, & approving the Bill of
which the petitioners complain, be
affirmed for the charges of the Grand
Lodge.

Yours faithfully to command

[illegible]
Secretary

Dy: Commissioner has since, regretted
in appointing him, as in very bad
circumstances having lost all his prop-
ty & trust & is being every day driven
to debts; he has misappropriated the
property of the temple and has contracted
debts to such an extent that it is
impossible for him to liquidate
during his entire life time.

The appointment of Patel as the
head of the village being of a very
responsible nature, preference for
such an appointment is being given
according to the Gazetteers, ~~giving~~
given in all the Lists of the Province
to really well-to-do & respectable, encum-
bered adhering to this principle
and making other arrangements for the
Patelee office of the Government
village, the Dy: Comm^r
the charge of the Divis.
to the said Gauge ~~[redacted]~~

Enclosed circular petition
respectfully be referred by Senate
under rule 24 and the 4th Joint
Rule to the Joint Select Committee
charged with the consideration
of matters connected with the
Report of Census for 1886.

For Secretary of Senate,
Petitioners in this Proceeding,

Client Request of

Geo Comstock Coleman Attorney
for

L. R. 31-87-2

25

9C-2

No. 753. (1)

Mysore Dewan's Office,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

Official Memorandum.

The accompanying Petition No. 3753, dated 13th January 1888 received at the Dewan's Office from Sampana Sivarama Iyer & Co. Merchants & Traders, Chitaldrug is forwarded, together with its Eight enclosures, to the Assistant Commissioner Chitaldrug Division for submission of Proceedings.

BANGALORE, 20th January 1888.

Draft

By Order,

for Dewan Secretary.

Mysore Government Press, Bangalore.—5-10-86.—2000.

From Dewan's No. 753 dated 20-1-88

OFFICE OF THE
8800
8 MAR 88
MAIN OF MYSORE.

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kampur District

To (2) Chief
The Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated Kampur Camp 5th March 1888.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 2 Inside

General No.
No. 525 | 1887-88.

Sir,

Adverting to your official memorandum No. 753 dated 29th Feby. forwarding petition No. 3083 from Ranganna &c, Sadidar Patel of Kaveri-kuppy, Gubbi Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith the proceedings as called for.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servt.

Deputy Commissioner

Encl.

To

Chief Secretary

No. R. 31-87-8

× Enclosures returned

27 (3) ~~(4)~~

To

The Sec'y, Treasury

Department

L. R. 31-87-4

~~21st~~ 16/8 July 1908

No. 110/23 Enclosure file—

In returning herewith, for reference and consideration, the appeal of Benjamin ~~Hanna~~ Hanna Sanda, a native of, as said, the Amerindian village, Village of Fort Fairfax, received with letter to Sec'y of Treasury 8/8 from Sec'y of Commerce & Labor, the writer begs to suggest that the bill be so paid as to exempt the native Hanna Sanda, ~~appellant~~ ~~and his wife~~, the attorney and ~~another native~~ agent, ~~who~~ in charge of the office, as he has been doing the work.

2. The amount of Police allowance to the Village and Amerindian Agent to be stated. Information should also be furnished as to whether the appellant ~~was~~ has prosecuted still insists this claim ~~has not been settled~~

X The words "Hanna Sanda, appellant" by the Sec'y" are not in the original.

Received

Ryder

Draft
6/4/96

for Secretary, Gen'l of
Navy Dept.

Gen. 31]



Submitted with reference to the Revenue Commissioner's order on Kundan Raj Canal's letter dated 5.3.1886.

30/4/96

2/12/96

2/12/96.

Postponed in view to consult Chief Engineer

Dated 23/12/96

23-12-96

Recd 25/12/96.

Forwarded to Chief Engineer for information and necessary action.

From The Deputy Commissioner, Amritsar District.

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Punjab, Irrigation Branch, Revenue Department.

Dated 24th

Despatched 24 December 1896.

Received 1896.

General No. 470
No.

Enclosure No. 1 Letter from the Executive Engineer, Bari Doab Canal, dated 18th December 1896.

Amritsar forwards information in connection with the representation of Sampuran Singh and others of Amritsar Tahsil.

L.R. 31-87-5

Pd. Mandi 26/11/96

Refer to Punjab 26/11

Reg 27/11/96

No 433
Oct 23

Dated, Seventh District
Yukon, Territory, 24th November
1896

To The Secretary to the Government
of Alberta, General Revenue
Department

Sir

With reference to your Letter
No. 110 dated the 6th July, 1896 calling
for certain information in connection
with the appeal of one Gangnon
Blanchard in the Police Court
in re the Petit of Alexis Nelli
Armandière, I have the honor to submit
herewith the enquiries and
Comments as with the case together
with the Exhibits, and also Report No 507
dated 1st September 1896, from which
it will be seen that Mr. Wade,
whose recent age it is
fact in charge of the Police office in
September, 1893 and that he has been
doing the work satisfactorily -
2 The Police Court Ordinance
will be found in volume Revised Ordinances
of N.W.T. 1888 at page 1 -
Mr Police attorney to the Court of the
Supreme Court Ordinance 30-5 -

31

Application for Land

Sir

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

Nicholas Ladd

Deputy Commissioner

&c.

No 5486

32 (6)

Proceedings of the Magistrate

L. R. 31-87-6

Read:—

(1) Petition No 3083, dated 13th January 1888, presented by Gangamma of Ravindrelli, Gudlu Lingu, appealing against the order of the Deputy-Commr of Tumkur directing the Patel of Ravindrelli-Amanikere to be registered in the name of Respondent- Hanne Gowda.

(2) Correspondence ending with letter No 479 dated 24th November 1887, from the Deputy Commr, Tumkur dated submitting certain information called for by Court in the matter.

(3) Records relating to the case.

—u—

Facts of the case.

Ramireddi and Narain-
which had no recognised Patel system
Reddi. Ramireddi, having been
at the Survey Settlement, con-
stituted into a Patel Patel
Charge, enquiry was made
in 1886 for the purpose of
appointing one to the charge.
Lyanagauda, Patel of Ramin-
halli claimed the office
on the ground that his
duties were discharged by
his brothers and latterly
by himself, and prayed
for its registry in the name
of his grandson, Hanumgauda.
Appellant Lyanagauda, disputed
by, the other Dividers, but them
he is entitled to half share
in the Patel Watt of Ramihalli
put forth his claim, stating
that his brother and then
his maternal uncle on his
behalf discharged the duties,
and that undisputed to the
Survey Settlement, Lyanagauda
entered

called upon the duties to the exclusion of other Nawabs whom he ~~had~~ guided with the promise that he would give them one of the two elephants at the Patela Potaji Settlement. The Deputy-Commissioner ordered that as it was necessary to conciliate the wishes of Gangaram who had been doing duty all along, his grandson Hanumantsinghji should be regarded as Patel of Amanikere, the duties being performed by a Gumasta during his minority. Gangaram has appealed against this order. The Deputy-Commissioner now reports that Hanumantsinghji who has attained his majority holds the Patelki of Amanikere, while that of Kurinkalli is held by his father Gangaram, and that the Potaji amounts [illegible]

the village and the Amani-
kere are Rs 103/4 and Rs 21/2
respectively.

---u---

(11bb) Section of Govt. No. 55 / Sett. 90-93 Govt. Vs. Enu. Vaipeeredo.

There is no doubt that
appellant is also Nekdar,
who along with 3 others is
entitled to half share. But
since Survey Settlement in 1892,
the land has been wholly
enjoyed by Respondent's family
in the shape of two separate
charges (Mavinkalli and
Amanikere.) The Respondent
Annegauda is Patil of
Amanikere, and his father
Ajingegauda (who appeared
before ~~the~~ Government ~~this~~
~~thing~~ and was heard) enjoyed
the Patili of Mavinkalli
~~village~~ 15 years. They cannot
therefore be evicted. But when
the Survey Rent, the claim
of

3/6

of appellant and of his
cohabitee will be considered,
and the vacant charge
adjusted so as to admit
of the village Patidjal-
laal, which is a smaller
charge, being conferred
on appellant or in his
family.

Draft
C.+3 For Secretary.

Sub Ex 1st Councillor
M2
23/1

To the Deputy Commissioner
Jaintia District, Jowai
Records.

23/1/97

S.V.
23/1/97

Checked the Records. The
file was very much disarranged
& there were no details in the Record

3/1

Noted
M.A. 5-2-97

31 (5)

No. 5003/L.R./87.

L.R. 31-87-7

Dated: 23/11/87

For Secretary

By Order

Dated -

For Secretary

By Order

Let me see the R of in this case
where was the appeal pending for
9 years.

1898 71

No. 2046

Name of Petitioner Gangamma

Village Hanumanahally

Taluk Gubbi

District Tumkur

Date of Arzi 7-1-98

Date of Receipt 21-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 3

Ref 16/2/98 S.R. 31-87-8

Ver. Records & Papers.

16/2/98

6629

P.740-96

24-2-98.

26/2/98

Ex parte

ABSTRACT

This is an appeal by the Plaintiff against the order of Court: dismissing the petitioner's Endorsement no: 3083 dated 23-1-97 on the following grounds

1) That the appellant has been in long legal possession of the land

2) That the panchas of the Gram Panchayat and Gram panchayat members fixed the value of the land at Rs 1000 at the time of survey settlement in 1882, it increased, as the Appellant exchanged the land

Vill 15-1-87-

(3) That it is evident from the Affidavit filed that the Appellant was the lawful claimant for the office -

(4) That the delay in preferring office appeal & giving address possession to Some funds, without Final order, cannot defeat the rightful claim of the Petitioner - The Govt.

(5) That while recognising the appellant as a Minister for the office, there seems no reason to disturb the office held by him in favour of another,

(6) That it is fair & equitable under the circumstances represented that he should have been appointed for the office originally before persons

(7) That he has reason to show that he suffered the Petition of a Lotail till he was displaced by the Appellant

Prays that the record may be sent for & perused & Equitable order may be, restoring him to the Petitioner of Emoluments of

[illegible]



Ret. 2042
26 Stamps
No 235

41

To
His Highness the Maharaja
Regent of Mysore
Bangalore



This is an appeal petition submitted by Rangamma of Maramachalli of Chikkanahally Halli, Gubbi Taluq, Tumkur District against the Endorsement of Revenue office No. 1383/52 dated 23rd January 1893 herein enclosed.

Respectfully Sheweth.

1. That your Highness will be pleased to notice that this Endorsement was given to

to grant the license as the 23rd January 1889 to the petitioner dated 13th January 1888 & produced upon the hearing of the petition by the Secretary's office.

2. That no notice in the London Gazette & Times & Standard newspapers was given by the Chairman of Licensing Sessions [illegible] 1888, as the petitioner knew to Licensing after the 15th January 1887, which is one of days specified by Statute for Commissioners of Income Tax [illegible] 15th January 1887 which is [illegible] the date of the petition, Commissioners [illegible].

Fp 3.

that from the Annaldar's
report to the Deputy in
Commissioner dated 2nd
November 1856 the necessity
for the appointment of a
separate Patel for Mauza
Kalli Amani Kaira, was
found incumbent by the
Annaldar who made an after
full enquiry recommended
your petitioner as the proper
man and legal Hakdar
for the Post, as the petitioner
was looking after the work
at the time, which is
evident from the copy of
the Annaldar's report herein
enclosed:

4. That your petitioner immediately
after he was displaced by
Mauna Gowda according
to the order of the Deputy
Commissioner the appealed
to the Revenue office which

the present Petitioner of the Annual Rent has been holding the post during the time the appeal of the petitioner was pending disposal he has no reason why the present Patel should not be removed and the petitioner the proper Annual be appointed for the place.

7. That as your petitioner is recognized by the rules of the Deccan office to be both Khatedar of the entire Patel-ship of Bhamora Kalli and the Annual Rent before appointment and as he was found by the Authorities to be working after the Annual Rent work at the time of the appointment of a hereditary Patel for the Annual Rent, it is fair and Equitable that he should have been appointed for the last as he was enjoying it for

his

his half share.

8. That your petitioner has sufficient reason to believe that he is unable to pay the said sum of £ [illegible] by reason of his poverty. Circumstances which he will be ready to prove; he has used all means in his power to raise the same but has not succeeded.

9. Your petitioner therefore humbly prays your Excellency will be pleased to direct that the proceeds of the said sale may be applied to pay your petitioner the said sum of £ [illegible] with interest thereon at the rate of [illegible] per cent. per annum from the date of the said Sheriff's sale, and your petitioner will ever pray.

Your petitioner begs to refer your Excellency to the annexed affidavit of [illegible] in support of the allegations of this petition.

Sworn before me at [illegible] this [illegible] day of [illegible] 1[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Justice of the Peace for the County of [illegible]

5- 3- 98

47

8

ಸಬ್ಜಾರ್ ನಿಧಾರ್ಕ ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ಮೈಸೂರು ನಿಸ್ಬತ್ತು ಕಛೇರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಎಚ್.ಡಿ.ಕೋಟೆ

ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಹೊಸ ಕಲಿಕಾಲ ಗೆ ಯಿಂತಾವನ್ನ ಹುಕುಂ.

ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ನೀವು

11-2-98 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಮುಕೊಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಮುತಾರಾಜ ರೀಜಂಟರವರ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರಾಗಿ, ಈ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರುವ ಸಂಗತಿಗಳ ಸದ್ಯಾಲೋಚನೆಯಿಂದ, ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟೀಕರಣವಾಡಲು ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಿರುವದಾಗಿ ಶ್ರೀಯುತ ಮುತಾರಾಜ ರೀಜಂಟರವರು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಆಂಶವನ್ನು ನಿಮಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುತ್ತೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಮುಂತ್ತಾಗಿಗಳನ್ನು ನಾವಸು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತೆ.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 4 ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ ಕಾರ್ಚಿಕ್

ಸನ್ 1898 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಹೊಕ್ಕಾಂ ಚಿಕ್ಕಾಮಾಲ

By Order,

Secretary.

3/3/98